

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-70, as amended, remain herein.

1. Claims 34, 36, 38 and 53 have been amended mooted the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

2. Claims 27 and 59 have been amended mooted the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

3. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 16-18, 20, 21, 34-38, 40, 42, 49-51, 53-55 and 68-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Wagner U.S. Patent 5,933,130.

Wagner discloses an anti-eye strain system that automatically varies the brightness of the display on a periodic basis. By varying the brightness on a periodic basis, Wagner's system purports to reduce eye-strain. Wagner discloses the use of a digital-to-analog converter to compare values sent by the computer to a table that contains matching voltage levels for the three colors needed to create the particular color and brightness; see col. 2 lines 43-49. Wagner's digital-to-analog converter produces measured voltage values. Wagner's table contains desired target values for the voltage levels. The difference between Wagner's measured voltage values and the desired voltage values in the table gives the correction voltage value used to adjust the voltage applied to the pixel. However, Wagner is silent on how the desired target values contained in the table are determined. Thus, Wagner does not disclose luminance setting values determined from measured luminance information of the pixel as claimed by applicants.

In addition, the parameters for Wagner's varying the brightness periodically are based on causing the human eye to refocus. Thus, Wagner does not disclose predetermined time intervals varied according to luminance degradation characteristics as claimed by applicants.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Wagner does not disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention and therefore is not a proper basis for a §102 rejection thereof. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in Wagner which would have suggested applicants' claimed invention. Thus reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, and allowance of all claims 1-5, 7-9, 16-18, 20, 21, 34-38, 40, 42, 49-51, 53-55 and 68-70 are respectfully requested.

4. Claims 6, 13-15, 19, 22, 25-29, 39, 46-48, 52, 56-64 and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Wagner and Fan U.S. Patent 6,097,356.

Claims 6, 13-15, 19, 22, 25-29, 39, 46-48, 52, 56-64 and 66, which depend on claims 3, 5, 36 and 38 are allowable for the same reasons explained above herein for claims 3, 5, 36 and 38. Fan discloses a method of calibrating a field emission display (FED) or cathode ray tube (CRT) if there is a degrading effect, but does not supply what is lacking in Wagner.

For all of the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in either of Wagner or Fan that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in either Wagner or Fan that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of this rejection of claims 6, 13-15, 19, 22, 25-29, 39, 46-48, 52, 56-64 and 66 and allowance of the same are therefore respectfully requested.

5. Claims 24, 30-33 and 62-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Wagner and Howard et al. U.S. Patent 6,023,259.

Claims 24, 30-33 and 62-65, which depend on claims 3 and 36, are allowable for the same reasons explained above herein for claims 3 and 36. Howard discloses that gray levels can be generated by either amplitude modulation and/or pulse width modulation, but does not supply what is lacking in Wagner.

For all of the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in either of Wagner or Howard that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in either Wagner or Howard that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of this rejection of claims 24, 30-33 and 62-65 and allowance of the same are therefore respectfully requested.

6. Claims 26-29 and 58-61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Wagner, Fan, and Doherty U.S. Patent 2,619,228.

Claims 26-29 and 58-61, which depend from claims 3 and 36, are allowable for the same reasons explained above herein for claims 3 and 36. Doherty discloses providing gray shade control, but does not supply what is lacking in Wagner and Fan.

For all of the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of Wagner, Fan, or Doherty that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of Wagner, Fan, or Doherty that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or

suggest applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of this rejection of claims 26-29 and 58-61 and allowance of the same are therefore respectfully requested.

7. Claims 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Wagner and Ando U.S. Patent 4,672,275.

Claims 10-12, which depend from claim 3, are allowable for the same reasons explained above herein for claim 3. Ando discloses correcting luminance setting values during vertical blanking periods, but does not supply what is lacking in Wagner.

For all of the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in either of Wagner or Ando that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in either Wagner or Ando that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of this rejection of claims 10-12 and allowance of the same are therefore respectfully requested.

8. Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Wagner in view of Xie et al. U.S. Patent 6,025,819.

Claim 23, which depends from claim 3, is allowable for the same reasons explained above herein for claim 3. Xie discloses a display panel that includes gamma corrections, but does not supply what is lacking in Wagner.

For all of the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in either of Wagner or Xie that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art.

Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in either Wagner or Xie that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of this rejection of claim 23 and allowance of the same are therefore respectfully requested.

9. Claim 67 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Wagner, Fan, and Xie.

Claim 67, which depends from claim 36, is allowable for the same reasons explained above herein for claim 36. Xie discloses a display panel that includes gamma corrections, but does not supply what is lacking in Wagner and Fan.

For all of the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of Wagner, Fan, or Xie that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of Wagner, Fan, or Xie that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of this rejection of claim 67 and allowance of the same are therefore respectfully requested.

Accordingly, this application is now fully in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293 (Order No. 28951.3110). If further amendments would place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Serial No.: 10/089,802

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON



Roger W. Parkhurst, Reg. No. 25,177  
Tyson Y. Winarski, Reg. No. 41,381

Date: April 14, 2006

Steptoe & Johnson LLP  
1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
Tel: 202-429-3000  
Fax: 202-429-3902  
Docket No.: 28951.3110